

# REGULATORY OPENNESS AND FAIRNESS ACT OF 1999

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President I rise today to speak on the Regulatory Openness and Fairness Act of 1999, of which I am an original cosponsor.

This legislation will ensure that the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) will carry out its original intent while protecting agricultural producers from unnecessary regulations. The FQPA, enacted in 1996, was put in place to ensure that highest level of food safety. This is a necessary and worthwhile goal. However, the EPA currently makes rulings that are based on data without a sound science base. Instead, assumptions are based on propaganda and worst-case scenarios.

This legislation requires EPA to modernize the laws governing pesticide use, using science-based data and evaluations. This will ensure that American consumers will continue to receive the world's safest food supply, and still allow those agricultural producers that provide food and fiber the means to do so.

This bill will also require EPA to establish and administer a program for tracking the effect of regulatory decisions of U.S. agriculture as compared to world trends. Producers in other countries often do not face the regulatory nightmare American producers do. This will provide a measure for that different and the impact it has on agricultural producers in the U.S.

Additionally, this bill will establish a permanent Pesticide Advisory Committee including food consumers, environmental groups, farmers, non-agricultural pesticide users, food manufacturers, food distributors, pesticide manufacturers, federal and state agencies. Such a diverse group will serve all interests and maintain a safe food supply.

I thank Mr. HAGEL for sponsoring this fine bill and look forward to working with him in its passage. Through it we can work for the good of agriculture and food consumers alike.

# ADMINISTRATION'S CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT WITH CHINA

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column by Michael Kelly that appeared in the July 28th edition of the Washington Post. Mr. Kelly asks in his column whether it "strikes anyone as odd" that the Clinton-Gore Administration continues desperately to hand onto its policy of "constructive engagement" with China, even as Beijing breathes fire in response to reasonable statement made by the freely- and fairly-elected President of Republic of China on Taiwan.

This Senator, for one, has serious questions about the wisdom of President Clinton's foreign policy as it relates to China, and the competence of the Clinton-Gore Administration to protect and advance America's interest in this vital region of the world.

In response to statements by Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui that discussions and talks between Taiwan and China should be conducted on a "special state-to-state" basis, China has repeatedly issued not-so-veiled threats of its intent to use military force against Taiwan unless President Lee retracts his statements.

What was the response of the Clinton-Gore Administration? Let me reference a news story from the July 26th edition of the Washington Post entitled "Albright, Chinese Foreign Minister Hold 'Very Friendly Lunch.'" The article reads in part,

Lee's announcement triggered a ferocious response by Beijing. Washington also criticized it and dispatched a representative to pressure Taiwan to modify its statement.

Today, Albright said that Richard Bush, the U.S. envoy to Taiwan, told Lee "that there needs to be . . . a peaceful resolution to this and a dialogue. And I think that the explanations offered thus far don't quite do it."

Mr. President, this is an amazing as it is outrageous. Rather than defend the Republic of China on Taiwan and its right to live in peace and choose its own form of government, Secretary of State Albright has a "very friendly lunch" with one of the highest ranking members of the repressive communist Chinese regime while one of her assistants reprimands and pressures Taiwan to appease China. Can it truly be our nation's policy is to protect China from Taiwan?

Taiwan is not the bully in this matter. Taiwan deserves America's commitment to defend it against China's threats. Our nation should proudly and firmly stand by Taiwan, a blooming and prosperous democracy where free speech, religious freedom and the benefits of capitalism are practiced and enjoyed. The United States should stand in the future, as it has in the past, for freedom and democracy whenever those great qualities are threatened by the forces of repression.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "On The Wrong Side," by Michael Kelly be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1999]

## ON THE WRONG SIDE

(By Michael Kelly)

Back in the dear, dead days when the Democratic Party stood for dreams a bit loftier than clinging to power, the labor wing of the party liked to ask a question: "Whose side are you on?" It was a good question because it was an awkward one and an inescapable one. The question presents itself these days, awkwardly and inescapably as always, in the matter of Taiwan and China. Whose side are we on?

On the one hand, we have Taiwan, which is an ally and a democracy. It is not a perfect ally nor a perfect democracy (but neither is the United States). Formed out of the nationalist movement that lost China to Mao's Communists, Taiwan increasingly has wished for independent statehood. In recent years, as the island has become more demo-

cratic and more wealthy, it has become more aggressive in expressing this wish.

On the one hand, we have China. The People's Republic is a doddering, desperate despotism, in which a corrupt oligarchy presides, only by the power of the gun, over a billion people who would rather live in freedom. China has always regarded Taiwan as an illegitimately errant province, ultimately to be subjugated to Beijing's rule. In recent years, as China's rulers have found themselves increasingly uneasy on their thrones, they have attempted, in the usual last refuge of dictators, to excite popular support by threatening belligerence against an exterior enemy—in this case, Taiwan.

For two decades, the United States has supported a deliberately ambiguous policy, which says that there should be "one China," but carefully does not say who should rule that China. Ambiguity worked pretty well for a long time, but it is a Cold War relic whose logic has expired, and its days are running out.

Two weeks ago, Taiwan's president, Lee Teng-hui, recognized this reality and said that henceforth Taiwan and China should deal with each other on a "state-to-state" basis. Beijing reacted with its usual hysterical bellicosity. This week, Chinese Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan used a session of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to again threaten Taiwan: "If there occur any action for Taiwan independence and any attempt by foreign forces to separate Taiwan from the motherland, the Chinese people and government will not sit back," Tang said. He added a warning to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to "be very careful not to say anything to fan the flames" of independence.

Not to worry. Neither Madame Secretary nor anyone else in the Clinton administration has the slightest intention of fanning freedom's flames. Quite the contrary. The administration has reacted to Lee's "state-to-state" remarks by repeatedly reassuring Beijing that the United States is entirely with it in this matter. On Monday Albright made a point of saying that Lee's efforts to back off of his remarks "thus far don't quite do it." So, we are on China's side.

We are on the side of a regime that, the administration's own Justice Department tells us, has engaged in (1) a massive and perhaps still ongoing campaign to steal America's most valuable nuclear secrets; and (2) an effort to corrupt the 1996 elections by funneling cash to, principally, the Clinton-Gore campaign and the Democratic National Committee.

We are on the side of a regime that, the administration assures, is becoming more tolerant of political freedom. Is that so? Beijing has intensified the persecution of political dissidents since Clinton began his policy of "constructive engagement" with China. Most recently, Beijing has been hosting old-fashioned Stalinist show trials of democratic dissidents; three organizers of the fledgling China Democratic Party drew sentences of, respectively, 13, 12 and 11 years.

China also continues its campaign to destroy independent religious movements. Accordingly to the group Human Rights in China, the regime arrested 7,410 leaders of the Protestant house-church movement in two months last year. Currently, Beijing is undertaking a countrywide effort to stamp out the spiritual movement Falun Gong. The New York Times reports that more than 5,000 people have been arrested, and 1,200 government officials who are movement members have been shipped off to re-education schools to study Communist Party doctrine.

We are on the side of a regime that forces abortions on women who attempt to give "unplanned" births; a regime that exploits